



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,372	02/21/2002	Christian Kraft	004770.00789	5016
22507	7590	10/08/2010	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			HAJNIK, DANIEL F	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2628		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		10/08/2010		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/078,372	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KRAFT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> DANIEL F. HAJNIK	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2010.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-13 and 15-26 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-13 and 15-26 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/7/2010 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In particular, the claimed computer-readable storage medium may be a signal or carrier wave. In the new guidance issued by the office, specifying a "storage" medium in this case is not enough to clearly distinguish it away from signal embodiments. For example, invention as a whole is directed towards cellular network and cordless networks (see page 4, lines 17-24). The specification does not absolutely rule out that a signal cannot also be a storage medium. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonable interpret a computer-readable storage medium as it is known in the cellular phone technology to include signals or propagated waves. Each of these

claims, that are non-statutory, includes a computer-readable storage medium as at least one of their components. In particular such a "transitory" or signal type of computer readable medium is non-statutory (please also refer to the following memo issued by the office: [http://www.uspto.gov/patents/law/notices/101\\_crm\\_20100127.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/patents/law/notices/101_crm_20100127.pdf) ).

Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101. One useful and possibly helpful description of the claimed computer-readable medium is to indicate in the claim that it is a "non-transitory" type of computer readable medium.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. (US Patent 5,870,683) in view of Gonsalves et al. (US Patent 6,128,001) in further view of Montalbano et al. (US Patent 5,918,237).

As per claim 1, Wells teaches the claimed:

1. A method comprising:

receiving, in the device, a user selection of the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image (*in the abstract, "the mobile station is adapted to enable the user to selectively: enable or disable the display of a graphical information sequence; and/or select a graphical information sequence to be displayed from a plurality of pre-stored graphical information sequences"; please note, emphasis is added to this quote and others like it from the prior art in this office action*);

displaying the first image as a bit-map pattern (*in figures 4A-4C where the first image frame is an animation sequence is a first image; also see col 5, lines 17-18*);

displaying, on the display of the device, the changed time-based sequence of images associated with the first image in the predetermined order and with the predetermined time intervals between the images (*in figure 1 where the images are displayed on display 20 and col 4, lines 1-3, "displayed sequentially present an information and/or promotional and/or entertainment message on the display 20 using a certain frame (refresh) rate"; one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a certain frame rate or refresh rate has a certain predetermined time interval between each image as it is displayed; also see col 4, lines 20-22 as well*).

displaying, on a display of a device, first images of a plurality of time-based sequences of images previously stored within the device (*in figure 1 where the images are displayed on display 20 and in figures 4A-4C*).

Wells does not explicitly teach the remaining claim limitations.

Gonsalves teaches the claimed:

receiving user instructions to change individual pixels of the bit-map pattern (*col 1, lines 11-14 "A graphics editor performs the task of adding special effects to still pictures and to motion video segments using a graphics workstation."* and *col 1, lines 24-28 "To achieve a color change effect, the graphics editor, using a mouse, graphics tablet or similar input device"* and *col 1, lines 15-23, "Color changing is a special effect that involves changing the color of certain pixels within one or more video image frames. One application of color changing involves modifying the color of an object to make it more or less noticeable in the video image frame. Another application of color changing is to repair a damaged portion of the video image frame. A third application of color changing is to add color to a video image frame to generate the appearance of one or more new objects in the video image frame.";*);

storing the first image with the user-instructed changes to the individual pixels of the bit-map pattern (*where image changes and image data is stored in memory 28 in figure 1*);

automatically applying changes to other images in the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image based on the user-instructed changes to the individual pixels of the bit-map pattern (*col. 5, II. 42-52 "If the video frame that underwent the color change belongs to a sequence of frames, and the graphics editor wishes to make a similar color change to the other frames in the sequence, the graphics editor may move the alpha matte in the frame sequence using key frames, as illustrated in FIG. 4 ... The steps of the method can be repeated automatically using the general purpose computer 20, and the graphics editor need not manually define a Bezier form for each frame."*)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Gonsalves et al. into the system taught by Wells et al., because such incorporation would improve the overall efficiency of said system as images, within a sequence of images, comprising graphic content that is to be modified would be modified in such a manner that said images would not have to be recreated in their entirety. For example, if a color that is present in a plurality of images of a sequence is replaced with another color said plurality of images would not need to be recreated in their entirety. Instead only the respective portions of said images containing said color which is to be replaced would require modification.

Montalbano teaches the claimed:

detecting, by the device, a location of a cursor displayed on the display *and*; responsive to detecting the cursor being located on a first image of the displayed first images, the device displaying the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image in a predetermined order and with predetermined time intervals between the images, while still displaying the first images of the plurality of time-based sequences of images (*col 4, line 66 to col 5, line 10, "The MBRs include one or more of static graphic, animated graphic, video, audio and text components. When the user places his cursor over a multimedia bookmark, the browser may play audio data, animate a static graphic MBR, or change the MBR altogether"; in this case, if the user puts their cursor over one multimedia bookmark it will start playing animation according to the reference; if the MBRs contain multiple static graphics as well, this means that*

*(the bookmark with the cursor over it is playing animation while the static graphics will still display the first images of the their sequences).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Wells with Montalbano. Montalbano teaches one advantage of the combination in that using animation instead of a text image for a given selection in the bookmark menu means that information and meaning about that entry is conveyed better to the user (col 4, lines 23-32). The examiner believes that Wells would be capable of producing the functionality of Montalbano in col 4, line 66 to col 5, line 10 when they are combined because the system of Wells can already display animation (as shown in figures 3 and 4 of Wells) on a cell phone. Also, Wells has icons and user selection features (col 9, line 66 to col 10, line 1 and col 8, line 3 of Wells). Montalbano in the combination would be using the graphics capabilities to animate that already exist in Wells.

As per claim 8, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 1, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 15, Wells teaches the claimed:

15. The method according to claim 1, wherein the device comprises a mobile phone (*in figure 2, piece 10*).

As per claim 16, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 15, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 19, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 1, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 22, Wells teaches the claimed:

22. The method of claim 1, further comprising: displaying a last one of said sequence of images when said animation is stopped (*see col 5, lines 18-19 and col 6, lines 30-37*).

As per claim 23, Wells teaches the claimed:

23. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a user instruction to add movement to the displaying of the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image on the display of the device, wherein adding movement includes adding a speed and a direction to the displaying of the time-based sequence of images on the display of the device (*col 7, lines 10-15 where the direction is controlled and col 5, lines 60-63 where the refresh rate controls speed*).

As per claim 25, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 23, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

2. Claims 2-4 and 9-11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. (US Patent 5,870,683) in view of Gonsalves et al. (US Patent 6,128,001) in further

Art Unit: 2628

view of Montalbano et al. (US Patent 5,918,237) in further view of Gever et al. (US Patent 6,313,835).

As per claim 2, Wells teaches the claimed:

2. A method according to claim 1, wherein the displaying of the changed time-based sequence of images associated with the first image is repeated a number of times (*col 4, lines 42-44*), and Wells does not explicitly teach the remaining claim limitations.

Gever teaches the claimed:

further comprising: receiving, in the device, an input setting the number of times the displaying of the changed time-based sequence of images is to be repeated (*see the animation sequence editor options window in figure 5, this feature is shown for piece 112*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to control the number of times repeating occurs as taught by Gever with the teachings of Wells in order to give the user more control and flexibility over the displaying of the animation.

As per claim 3, Wells does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations.

Gever teaches the claimed:

3. A method according to claim 2, further comprising: comparing, by the device, the number of times the displaying of the changed time-based sequence of images is to be repeated with a predetermined number of times (*in figure 3, pieces 47 and 49 where scene and frame counters are used and col 13, lines 43-53; the system would have to perform the claimed comparing in order for the system to function properly with the control 112 in figure 5*); and

responsive to determining, based on the comparison, the number of times the displaying of the changed time-based sequence of images is to be repeated exceeds the predetermined number, the device repeating the displaying of the changed time-based sequence of images the predetermined number of times (*also in col 13, lines 43-53 where the number set in control 112 in figure 5 is the claimed "predetermined number of times"*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to control the number of times repeating occurs as taught by Gever with the teachings of Wells. The motivation of claim 2 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 4, Wells teaches the claimed:

4. A method according to claim 3, wherein the device repeats the display sequence said predetermined number of times when the device is subsequently reactivated (*col 8, lines 14-16 "The next time the user activates the Keyguard feature, the selected animation is automatically invoked, started, and run by the controller 18..."; Also, the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated herein.*)

As per claims 9-11, these claims are similar in scope to limitations recited in claims 2-4, respectively, and thus are rejected under the same rationale.

2. Claims 5, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. (US Patent 5,870,683) in view of Gonsalves et al. (US Patent 6,128,001) in further

view of Montalbano et al. (US Patent 5,918,237) in further view of Bickmore et al. (Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users).

As per claim 5, Wells does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations.

Bickmore teaches the claimed:

5. A method according to claim 1, further comprising resizing an image from the time-based sequence into a display size specific for an application in the device (*Bickmore et al. teach altering the display resolution of graphic information on a Palm-PC, PDAs and cellular phones responsive to the capabilities of said devices ("The Digestor system automatically converts web-based documents designed for desktop viewing into formats appropriate for handheld devices with small display screens, such as Palm-PCs, PDAs and cellular phones." -Abstract, II.1-3; § 1, paragraph 1 ; § 2.4, paragraph 1; "Figure 2 demonstrates how a web page can be re-authored for a smaller display. Some of the images have been scaled down and others have been replaced by links. Some text has also been replaced by links..." - § 3.1, paragraph 2; "Digestor also supports cellular phones that have very small text displays." - § 3.1, paragraph 3; "A rule of thumb for images is to reduce them all in size by a fixed percentage, dictated by the ratio of the display area that the document was authored for to the display area of the target device." - § 3.2, paragraph 4). It is noted that all graphic information, edited or not, located on a respective device is considered graphic information that is subject to said alteration taught by Bickmore et al. It is inherent that any displayed graphic image is associated, at least to some degree, with at least one program (e.g., application) running on said system).*

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate the ability to alter the resolution of graphic information presented on a wireless terminal as taught by Bickmore et al. into the system taught by Wells et al. and Gonsalves et al., which is directed toward the display and editing of animation information on a wireless terminal, because through such incorporation it would allow for said animation, edited or not, to be displayed at a resolution optimized to the capabilities of said terminal at all times resulting in said animation being displayed under the best available conditions and thus improving a user's viewing experience.

As per claims 12 and 20, these claims are similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 5, and thus are rejected under the same rationale.

2. Claims 6, 13, 17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. (US Patent 5,870,683) in view of Gonsalves et al. (US Patent 6,128,001) in further view of Montalbano et al. (US Patent 5,918,237) in further view of Bickmore et al. (Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users) in further view of GIF Construction Set Professional Homepage, referred to herein as GCSPH, and GIF Construction Set Professional Manual, referred to herein as GCSPM. It is noted that GCSPM includes references to "Introductory and Tutorial" and "Reference" which are considered part of said GCSPM.

As per claim 6, Wells does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations.

GCSPH and GCSPM teaches the claimed:

6. A method according to claim 5, wherein the resizing includes receiving a user selection of a portion of the image to be resized into the display size specific for the application in the device, and wherein the resizing further includes the device automatically resizing the remaining images in the time-based sequence of images (*GCSPH teaches that part or all of a given animation sequence can be rotated, cropped, color-adjusted or resized (GCSPH, p. 3). It is noted that cropping is considered a form of resizing. GCSPM teaches that "The Resize function ... will allow you to change the size of one or more images in a GIF file ... This function only affects the selected blocks in the current document window. To apply it to all the blocks in a GIF file, click on the green 'Tag All' button" (GCSPM, § Reference, pp. 15, 30-31). It is implicitly taught that said functions taught by both GCSPH and GCSPM are, at least in part, user controlled via some form of user input (e.g., while said system executes said functions said functions must be initiated by some form of user input).*

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate the conventional animation editing functions taught by both GCSPH and GCSPH, specifically that of resizing, into the system taught by Wells et al., Gonsalves et al. and Bickmore et al., which is directed toward editing and displaying an animation, because through such incorporation it would provide greater flexibility in terms of how a given user is able to edit said animation as well as provide options that are conventional (e.g., resizing graphic information) in the realm of animation editing. In addition, through such incorporation of a user controlled resizing function it would provide greater flexibility in terms of how said information is presented. For example, while an image may be automatically resized to fit a respective

display screen used to display said image a user may still wish to resize said already resized image to best suit said user's display needs.

As per claim 13, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 6, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 17 the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claims 1 and 2 are incorporated herein. Wells et al. teach that various functions of said system are accessible via menus (col. 3, II. 54-56; "...an Animation menu item..." - col. 8, II. 2-9).

It is noted that said graphic processing performed by Wells et al. is considered to read on pixel-wise editing as graphic information displayed via said mobile station is displayed on a screen comprised of pixels (col. 7, II. 47-50). Wells et al. teach the speeding up and slowing down of an animation ("...the refresh rate could increase or decrease as a function of the charge state of the battery 26, or as a function of the received signal strength level..." - col. 8, II. 51-54 ; "...an animation is comprised of X number of discrete images displayed at intervals of Y ms (selectable or fixed values..." - col. 9, II. 61-64).

However, Well et al. fail to explicitly teach a loop setting menu allowing the setting of the number of repetitions of the animation. GCSPM teaches an animation software application that has a loop command which adds a "LOOP block" to a given animation. Said "LOOP block" has an iterations argument that defines the number of times said animation will loop (GCSPM, § Reference, p. 34; GCSPM, § Introductory Tutorial, p. 4). GCSPM teaches a delay option which is defined as the number of hundredths of a second between images in an animation (GCSPM, §

Reference, p. 34). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of GCSPM, which are directed toward animation editing tools for assigning delay and limiting the number of times a given animation can be repeated, into the system taught by Wells et al. and Bickmore et al., which is directed toward editing and displaying animations on a mobile station as well as conserving power of said station (Wells et al., col. 8m, II. 64-67), because through such incorporation it would provide greater efficiency in terms of battery life for said mobile station as the number of repetitions for an animation could be set by a user of said mobile station dependant upon the power resources available to said mobile station (e.g., a user with a mobile station that is low on battery power might prefer that an animation which is to repeat an infinite number of times instead repeat a fixed number of times so to avoid an adverse impact to battery life).

In regard to resizing the rationale disclosed in the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein. It is implicitly taught that that the combination of Wells et al., Gonsalves et al., Bickmore et al., GCSPH and GCSPM is considered to result said animation features being menu accessible.

As per claim 18, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 15, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 21, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 6, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. (US Patent 5,870,683) in view of Gonsalves et al. (US Patent 6,128,001) in further view of Montalbano et al. (US Patent 5,918,237) in further view of Aihara (US Patent 6,223,190).

As per claim 24, Wells does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations.

Aihara teaches the claimed:

24. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a user instruction to add text to the first image (*col 2, lines 27-29, "There, the user formats the document by, for example, annotating the image with, for example, descriptive text"*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the annotating as taught by Aihara with the teachings of Wells in order to make the text messages in Wells in figure 3 more interesting by mixing images with the text.

As per claim 26, this claim is similar in scope to limitations recited in claim 24, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

#### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/7/2010 in regards to claim 23 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

For example, amended claim 23 recites “receiving a user instruction to add movement to the displaying of the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image on the display of the device, wherein adding movement includes adding a speed and a direction to the displaying of the time-based sequence of images on the display of the device.” In rejecting previous claim 23, the Office Action relies on Wells at col. 5, lines 35-45 and col. 8, lines 23-43 describing Scroll Text Animation in which a text string is scrolled across a display in a Scroll Direction to show the feature of receiving a user instruction to add movement to the at least one image. However, adding a text string to be scrolled across a display in a particular scroll direction is not the same as adding movement, *including a speed and a direction*, to the displaying of a time-based *sequence of images* on a display, as claimed. Further, Wells describes that the text is scrolled at the refresh rate defined for the Scroll Text Animation, and thus does not teach or suggest adding a *speed* to the displaying of a sequence of images. As such, claim 23 is distinguishable over the asserted combination of Wells and Gonsalves for at least these additional reasons.

(middle of page 8 in filed response).

The examiner respectfully maintains that the prior art rejections in this matter are proper because Wells teaches of animation control aspects that are similar to those described in the claims. For example, consider col 7, lines 10-15, this passage from the reference is shown as follows (see the following page):

Description: This function returns the mode of the specified animation. This function is useful in, by example, a note service, when checking whether to write the note's text or pass it to the animation. In general, the animation mode affects the appearance of an animation, and can be used to cause a given animation sequence to be displayed in different ways (e.g., to scroll in a specified direction).

---

In this passage particularly at the end, Wells indicates the control ability to scroll in a specified direction. This is similar to the claims because claim 23 requires control of the direction of an animation or displaying of a sequence of images.

Further, Wells teaches in col 5, lines 60-63 of controlling the refresh rate. This is a speed control because the refresh rate determines how quickly the animation progresses through the sequence of images to be displayed.

Applicant's remaining arguments have also been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL F. HAJNIK whose telephone number is (571)272-7642. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30A-5:00P).

Art Unit: 2628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on (571) 272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Daniel F Hajnik/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628